

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are all of the claims pending in the application. By this Amendment, Applicant hereby adds claims 16-19.

I. Formal Matters

The Examiner returned the form PTO/SB/08 submitted with the Information Disclosure Statement of March 24, 2005, however, the Examiner failed to indicate consideration of the document listed in the non-patent literature documents section. The Examiner is respectfully requested to return the initialed form PTO/SB/08 indicating that all of the cited materials have been considered.

II. Summary of the Office Action

The Examiner rejected claims 1-9, 13, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). The Examiner rejected claims 10-12 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

III. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-9, 13, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,950,111 to Georger et al. (hereinafter “Georger”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider this rejection at least in light of the comments which follow.

Turning first to claim 1, the Examiner alleges that Georger discloses a “[s]ystem for the distribution of television (TV) type video signals with a frequency band of up to about 5 to 900 MHz,” as recited, *inter alia*, in claim 1. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Instead of distributing signals with a frequency band of up to about 5 to 900 MHz, according to Georger, a distribution panel is intended to accommodate the transmission of

broadband Community Antenna Television (CATV) RF signals over unshielded twisted-pair cabling for frequencies up to 550 MHz (although according to Georger it can process carrier frequencies up to 750 MHz) (*see* col. 3, lines 56-61; and col. 1, lines 7-11 of Georger).

Accordingly, Georger does not disclose a system for the distribution of television type video signals with a frequency band of up to about 5 to 900 MHz.

The Examiner further alleges that Georger discloses the following features, recited *inter alia*, in claim 1:

- a first input processing unit (1) comprising a coaxial input terminal (10), at least one low current terminal (11) for twisted wire pairs and processing means (14) for processing TV signals output from the coaxial cable so as to transform them into signals with substantially the same transmission characteristics on the same frequency band on a twisted wires pair,
- at least one second output processing unit (3) comprising a low current input port (33) for twisted wire pairs, a coaxial output terminal (31) and processing means (34) for processing signals output from a twisted wires pair (12) connected to the first input processing unit (1) so as to transform them into signals substantially identical to the signals output from the said coaxial cable (41)

Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Georger discloses a passive distribution panel and system that only provides for passive distribution (that is, without an external power supply) of a CATV RF signal carried by a coaxial cable on unshielded twisted-pair cables (*see* col. 3, line 62 through col. 4, line 1 of Georger).

The passive system according to Georger uses a splitter 14 to divide the coaxial based CATV RF signal (*see* col. 2, lines 60-64 of Georger). At the output of the splitter, there is a group of coaxial outlets. After the splitter 14, a coupler 20 passes the output signals from the splitter to the unshielded twisted pair cables 32 (*see* col. 3, lines 15-18 of Georger). The coupler 20

comprises a terminating means 30 designed to properly terminate the output signal when an unshielded twisted-pair cable is not connected to an output signal (*see col. 3, lines 18-21 of Georger*). At the output of the coupler, there is a modular output jack 45 which is designed to receive and electronically engage a standard modular plug 46 (*see col. 3, lines 36-38 of Georger*). A person of ordinary skill in the art would understand that a first input processing unit and a second output processing unit are not the same as the splitter and the coupler according to Georger because the splitter and coupler according to Georger are passive.

Moreover, Georger does not disclose or suggest further passing the signal from the twisted-pair cable to a coaxial cable. Instead, Georger discloses that there is a modular output jack designed to accommodate a modular plug, rather than a coaxial output terminal. Accordingly, Georger does not teach or suggest at least one second output processing unit comprising a coaxial output terminal and processing means for processing signals output from a twisted wires pair connected to the first input processing unit so as to transform them into signals substantially identical to the signals output from the said coaxial cable.

Thus, the distribution panel according to Georger is intended to accommodate signals up to 550 MHz., instead of 5 to 900 MHz.; provides only for passive distribution, rather than the processing units (which are active); and does not further pass the signal from the twisted pair cable to a coaxial cable.

At least for these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentable over Georger. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-9 and 13 are patentable over Georger at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 1.

Independent claim 15 recites features similar to, although not necessarily coextensive with, the features discussed above with respect to claim 1. For example, claim 15 recites, *inter*

alia, a “TV signals processing unit (1) with a frequency band varying from 5 to 65 MHz for the return channel and 86 to 862 MHz for the down channel.” Claim 15 also recites, *inter alia*, the following features:

processing means (14) for transforming TV signals output from the input terminal in signals with substantially the same transmission characteristics on the same frequency band and that can be transmitted for a twisted wires pair

means of cutting off (16) the signal transmission acting on the input side of output terminals (11) to cut off the signal transmission at an output terminal that is not connected indirectly, advantageously through a second output processing unit (3) connected to the said terminal through a cable consisting of twisted wire pairs, to a coaxial cable (53) connected to a TV set (5)

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 15 is patentable over Georger at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1.

IV. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Georger in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,323,427 to Rutledge et al. (hereinafter “Rutledge”). Claims 11, 12, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Georger in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,901,340 to Flickinger et al. (hereinafter “Flickinger”).

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 10-12 and 14 are patentable over Georger at least by virtue of their dependency on independent claim 1, as discussed above. The disclosure of Rutledge and Flickinger does not cure the deficiencies of Georger as discussed above with respect to independent claim 1. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 10 is patentable over Georger in view of Rutledge and that claims 11, 12, and 14 are patentable over Georger in view of Flickinger.

V. New Claims

Applicant hereby adds claims 16-19, which are supported throughout the specification. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 16 is patentable over Georger at least because claim 16 recites, *inter alia*, “the second output processing unit transforms signals from the twisted wire pair cable into signals on the output coaxial cable.” Georger does not teach or suggest at least one second output processing unit comprising a coaxial output terminal. Nor does Georger teach or suggest transforming signals from a twisted wire pair cable into signals on an output coaxial cable. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 17-19 are patentable over Georger at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 16.

VI. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Eric S. Barr/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Eric S. Barr
Registration No. 60,150

Date: May 6, 2008